



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tian Church, and he actually makes the proposition that relation to the body is of the *essentia* of the soul, his main philosophical argument against objectors to the dogma of resurrection. Thus, in the *Summa contra Gentiles* (IV, 79), we read: *Anima corpori naturaliter unitur, est enim secundum suam essentiam corporis forma; est igitur contra naturam animæ absque corpore esse*, and there is much more to the same effect in II, 83, 84, of the same work. It is true that we constantly find divines of our own time confusing the Platonic conception of the immortality of the disembodied soul with the Christian belief in the redemption of the body and the resurrection of the whole man to everlasting life, but the confusion is not one which was current among scholastic theologians, and should be impossible to a modern divine who remembers the familiar formula which ends "preserve thy *body* and soul unto everlasting life."

I have said so much on these points that I have no further space left except to recommend this book very warmly to all readers who wish to get real insight into the nature of that revived interest in Aristotelianism which, side by side with the better-known Florentine rebirth of Neo-Platonism, prepared the way for the coming of Modern Philosophy in the latter half of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth.

P. S.—I could wish that the excellent practice of accurate transliteration of Oriental names had been a little more rigidly adhered to. "Avicbron" should surely fare as well in this respect as Avicenna and Averroes, and the great Caliph Al-Ma'mûn is hardly recognizable under the disguise of "Mahmound" (p. 30).

A. E. TAYLOR.

St. Andrews, N. B.

L'INDIVIDUALISMO NELLE DOTTRINE MORALI DEL SECOLO XIX. Di Giovanni Vidari. (Opera premiata dalle Reale Accademia di scienze moralie politiche di Napoli.) Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1909. Pp. xx, 400.

For extensive and masterly learning, combined with an uncommon power of subtle analysis, this essay must have amply deserved the prize for which it was composed. The author's own ethical point of view is indicated in the last chapter (pp. 324-388), where he gives a general estimate of the doctrines re-

viewed in the course of the work, and endeavors to extract from the very diverse phases of individualism which they exhibit, some common element or message which deserves to be incorporated in a complete moral philosophy. Here and there he seems to employ a kind of Hegelian dialectic, exhibiting doctrines as developing into their own opposites, and demanding a higher synthesis; but this method is not applied with much rigor, nor, so far as I can judge, with any convincing success. Still, the method may have helped the author more than it is likely to help his readers in penetrating sympathetically to the essential and central characters of a great variety of doctrines and tendencies, all of which he presents with judicial fairness and with the generous enthusiasm of a philosophic mind. The comparative critical study of so many thinkers,—French, German, and English, Scandinavia being represented by Kierkegaard and Ibsen, Russia by Tolstoy and Kropotkin, Italy being wholly unrepresented,—has suggested to the author many fine and valuable features of resemblance and difference, and his expositions can hardly fail to present to the systematic student of the thinkers of the nineteenth century many new points of view. An English reader, for example, nourished on the current antagonism to hedonism in general, and to Mill and Spencer in particular, might learn much from the luminous exposition here given of the various elements in the thought of these two thinkers, with their sources and tendencies. Three main species of individualistic thought are distinguished, which, subject to a few exceptions, are each assigned to different countries: Rationalistic Individualism, represented chiefly by French thinkers; Sensationistic Individualism, by English thinkers; and Instinctivistic Individualism, by German and Russian thinkers. This distribution of the respective varieties of individualism, the author seeks to connect with differences in the national characters of the various peoples. He refrains however from straining his conception of national characters, and even a reader who finds this description of the ‘psyche’ of the European nations superficial or, in the case of the French people, bewildering, need be in no fear that ‘national character’ will at any point be abused by the author for the purpose of sham explanation. No objection will, I think, be taken by one who has read the book, to the inclusion of any of the writers ranked as individualists, surprising as might appear, at a first view, the grouping of

Nietzsche and Tolstoy as Individualists of Instinct. But good reasons could be given for the inclusion of many important writers and movements which the writer has not included. The merit which he claims as common to all the thinkers classed as individualistic is that they have insisted on the personal aspect of morals: more particularly that they have recognized that the moral motive force is individual. This, he contends, is consistent with maintaining that the moral end is social or supra-individual. Further, he argues forcibly that the individual conscience can find no content and no opportunity for its exercise apart from social organization and unity.

The appreciation of historic forces is inadequate, though by no means absent. The author is well equipped for the task of writing the history of ethical thought and for the valuation of the social and intellectual forces at work in our own time.

W. J. ROBERTS.

University College, Cardiff, Wales.

SOCIOLOGY AND MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By Charles A. Ellwood, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, University of Missouri. New York: American Book Company, 1910. Pp. 331.

The reader must not expect to find in this book what its title might suggest, an outline of modern sociological principles. The author hastens to disavow in the preface any attempt "to give a systematic presentation of theory." He goes further to explain that he has left the student "to work out his own system of theory." The optimism of this plan is emphasized by the statement that the book is for use "where but a short time can be given to the subject" and is "especially suited for use in University Extension Courses and in Teachers' Reading Circles."

This sociology, with most of the sociology left out, consists of comprehensible discussions of the family and of a miscellaneous group of 'social problems,' the doctrine of population, immigration, the negro, the city, pauperism, crime, political socialism, and some aspects of education. The five chapters dealing with the family form the most nearly integrated portion of the book, and there is a slight suggestion of an intention of treating all the succeeding topics in relation to this central theme. The family ideal presented is not radical or iconoclastic; it is old-fashioned monogamy refined by the new democratic spirit,